

REMARKS

I. INTRODUCTION

Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 8-9, 11, and 14. Claims 6, 12, and 15-20 have been canceled. Claims 1-5, 7-11, and 13-14 are presently pending in this application. Reexamination and reconsideration are hereby respectfully requested.

II. OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

Applicants have adopted the recommendations of the Examiner in making amendments to the Abstract. The only difference is the language following "effectively." The Examiner had recommended using the phrase "by filling the apertures." Applicants use the language "by flowing through the apertures and sealing to itself" to more accurately conform to the language of the specification. Applicants also removed the use of legal phraseology in the Abstract.

The specification as originally filed included element 98 that did not appear in the drawings. Element 98 has been appropriately replaced in the specification by element 98_a or 98_b, each of which do appear in the drawings.

Additionally, the specification has been amended to include references to elements added to Figures 3 and 8 in the Detailed Description of a Preferred Embodiment. Finally, references to Figure 10 have been added to both the Brief Description of the Drawings and the Detailed Description of a Preferred Embodiment.

No new matter has been entered by these amendments. The amendments merely conform the specification to the drawings. Approval of the amendments is hereby respectfully requested. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections are hereby respectfully requested.

III. OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS

The first attached sheet of drawings includes Fig. 1. The Office objected to Fig. 1 for its failure to include element 26. Applicants submit the original sheet including Fig. 1, highlighting element 26 near the bottom center of the middle portion of Fig. 1.

The second attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 3. This sheet, which includes only Fig. 3, replaces the original sheet including only Fig. 3. In Figure 3, previously omitted element 102 has been added to both the middle portion of Fig. 3 labeled as 20_{INT} and

the bottom portion of Fig. 3 labeled as 20_{FINISH}. Additionally, in Figure 3, previously omitted element 78_(1, 2, . . . n) has been added to the portion of Fig. 3 labeled as 20_{INT}.

The third attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 6 and 8 and contains a new figure labeled as Fig. 10. This sheet, which includes Fig. 6-10, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 6-9. In Figure 6, previously omitted element 24 has been added. In Figure 8, previously omitted elements 112_a, 114, and 112_d have been added. Figure 10 shows the packaging envelope 80 on both the first side 122 and second side 120 of the terminal 24. The adhesive 83 is shown flowing through the apertures of the terminal.

The Examiner indicated that submission of clean, formal drawings could be deferred until the proposed corrections were considered and approved by the Examiner. Applicants will submit clean, formal drawings upon approval of the drawing amendments by the Examiner.

IV. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Particularly, claims 1-14 stand rejected as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out what the first region of the electrical terminal is adhered to and in electrical contact with. To clarify the electrical connection between the elements of claim 1, the formatting has been removed to more clearly indicate that the first region of the electrical terminal is adhered to and in electrical contact with the second region of the terminal, extending along the lengthwise axis of the terminal. Similarly, the formatting has been removed in amended claim 9 to more clearly indicate that the first region of the electrical terminal is adhered to and in electrical contact with the second region of the terminal, extending along the lengthwise axis of the terminal.

Additionally, the Office suggested that limitations noting the functions of the apertures and tang should be added to more clearly define the invention. Applicants have added a recitation noting the function of the apertures, namely “apertures . . . through which an adhesive flows from a first side to a second side of said terminal” in order to make claims 1 and 9 more definite and therefore, allowable. Applicants have added a limitation noting the function of the tang, namely “wherein said tang is electrically connected to a flexible circuit” in order to make claim 4 more definite and therefore, allowable. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-14 are sufficiently definite to meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claim 14 was rejected for reciting incorrect dependence. Claim 14 has been amended to recite proper dependence from claim 9. In addition, claim 11 has been amended to recite proper dependence from claim 9.

V. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Office indicated that claims 6, 8, and 12 were allowable subject matter because they defined over the prior art. Applicants appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter. Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to include the limitations of claims 6 and 12, respectively. Therefore, Applicants believe that these claims now overcome the rejections based on obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) or anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and are now allowable. Claim 8 has been amended only to depend from amended claim 1, and defines over the prior art by virtue of its dependency on claim 1, as amended.

VI. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-11, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lockard (U.S. 4,682,840) in view of Miyoshi (U.S. 5,222,811). In light of the claim amendments, Applicants respectfully submit this rejection has been overcome. Amended claim 1 now includes the limitations of allowable claim 6, namely, “wherein said apertures further comprise L-shaped and I-shaped apertures in a repetitive pattern,” and claim 1 is now allowable. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

Claims 2-5 and 7 depend from claim 1 directly or indirectly, and therefore contain all the limitations thereof. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons given above in connection with claim 1, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Amended claim 9 now includes the limitations of allowable claim 12, namely, “wherein said apertures further comprise L-shaped and I-shaped apertures in a repetitive pattern,” and claim 9 is now allowable. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 10-11 and 13 depend from claim 9 directly or indirectly, and therefore contain all the limitations thereof. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons given above in connection with claim 9, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

VII. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 5, and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Eytcheson et al. (U.S. 5,539,254) (“Eytcheson et al. ‘254”). Applicants respectfully overcome this rejection. Amended claim 1 now includes the limitations of allowable claim 6, namely, “wherein said apertures further comprise L-shaped and I-shaped apertures in a repetitive pattern,” and claim 1 is now allowable. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 5 and 7 depend from claim 1 directly and therefore contain all the limitations thereof. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons given above in connection with claim 1, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

VIII. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-11, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eytcheson et al. (U.S. 6,054,765) (“Eytcheson et al. ‘765”) in view of Eytcheson et al. ‘254 and Furnival (U.S. 5,408,128). In light of the claim amendments, Applicants respectfully submit this rejection has been overcome. Amended claim 1 now includes the limitations of allowable claim 6, namely, “wherein said apertures further comprise L-shaped and I-shaped apertures in a repetitive pattern,” and claim 1 is now allowable. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 2-5 and 7 depend from claim 1 directly or indirectly and therefore contain all the limitations thereof. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons given above in connection with claim 1, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Amended claim 9 now includes the limitations of allowable claim 12, namely, “wherein said apertures further comprise L-shaped and I-shaped apertures in a repetitive pattern,” and claim 9 is now allowable. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 10-11 and 13 depend from claim 9 directly or indirectly, and therefore contain all the limitations thereof. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons given above in connection with claim 9, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

IX. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9-11, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Furnival in view of Hammerly et al. (U.S. 2,738,445) and Eytcheson et al. '254. In light of the claim amendments, Applicants respectfully submit this rejection has been overcome. Amended claim 1 now includes the limitations of allowable claim 6, namely, "wherein said apertures further comprise L-shaped and I-shaped apertures in a repetitive pattern," and claim 1 is now allowable. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 2-3, 5, and 7 depend from claim 1 directly or indirectly, and therefore contain all the limitations thereof. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons given above in connection with claim 1, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Amended claim 9 now includes the limitations of allowable claim 12, namely, "wherein said apertures further comprise L-shaped and I-shaped apertures in a repetitive pattern," and claim 9 is now allowable. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 10-11 and 13 depend from claim 9 directly or indirectly and therefore contain all the limitations thereof. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons given above in connection with claim 9, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

09/918,877
DP-304,881

X. CONCLUSION

For at least the above-cited reasons, all claims pending in the present application are now believed to be allowable. Early receipt of a Notice of Allowance is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 12, 2003

By: Jimmy L. Funke
Jimmy L. Funke, Reg. No. 34,166
Attorney for Applicants
Delphi Technologies, Inc.
Mail Code 480-410-202
P.O. Box 5052
Troy, Michigan 48007-5052
(248) 813-1214